

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE PLASTICS ADDITIVES :
ANTITRUST LITIGATION :
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: :
Gitto/Global Corp. v. Rohm & Haas Co., :
et al., No. 03-CV-2038 :
(Direct Purchaser Class Action) :
:

ORDER

AND NOW, this 31st day of August 2010, upon consideration of Plaintiffs' Revised Motion for Class Certification (Doc. Nos. 458 & 459), Defendants' Supplemental Response in Opposition to the Motion for Class Certification (Doc. No. 473), Plaintiffs' Reply in Further Support of their Revised Motion for Class Certification (Doc. No. 474), Defendants' Second Supplemental Brief in Opposition to the Motion for Class Certification (Doc. No. 494), Plaintiffs' Supplemental Memorandum in Support of their Revised Motion for Class Certification (Doc. No. 498), Plaintiffs' Post-Hearing Submission (Doc. No. 508), Defendants' Outline of Evidence Presented at the June 28-30, 2010 Class Certification Hearing (Doc. No. 509), Plaintiffs' Post-Hearing Memorandum in Further Support of their Revised Motion for Class Certification (Doc. Nos. 510 & 514), Defendants' Post-Hearing Memorandum in Further Opposition to the Motion for Class Certification (Doc. No. 513), Plaintiffs' Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law (Doc. No. 512), and Defendants' Proposed Findings of Fact and

Conclusions of Law (Doc. No. 511),¹ it is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Revised Motion for Class Certification is DENIED for the reasons set forth in this Court's Memorandum Opinion issued this same day.

BY THE COURT:

/S/LEGROME D. DAVIS

Legrome D. Davis, J.

¹Both Plaintiffs and Defendants incorporate by reference the arguments set forth in the briefing of the original Motion for Class Certification (Doc. No. 213) that was filed in August of 2005.